



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/654,618	09/04/2003	Young-Chan Kim	1293.1851	5000
21171	7590	12/31/2007	EXAMINER	
STAAS & HALSEY LLP			SHERMAN, STEPHEN G	
SUITE 700				
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
WASHINGTON, DC 20005			2629	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/31/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/654,618	KIM ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Stephen G. Sherman	2629

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 6 November 2007.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-58 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-58 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 04 September 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This office action is in response to the Appeal Brief filed 6 November 2007.

Claims 1-58 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-46 and 48-58 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

3. Applicant's arguments filed with respect to claims 47-48 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

On page 22 of the Appeal Brief the applicant has argued the rejection of independent claims 47 and 48 with respect to the rejection using the Takano reference. Specifically the applicant argues on page 23 that "Takano does not discuss or suggest that the DVT 105 includes an input port changing unit that switches from an analog input port to a digital input port when the DVT 105 determines the analog input port is not receiving a normal analog input signal or switches from the digital input port to the analog input port when the DVT 105 determines that the digital input port is not receiving normal digital input signal". The examiner would like to remind the applicant that the amendment filed 4 June 2007 attempting to amend claims 47 and 48 to state "an input port changing unit for switching from the digital/analog input port to the analog/digital input port when the displaying device determines that the digital/analog

input port is not receiving a normal digital/analog input signal" was not entered. As such, the claims still state "an input port changing unit for switching from the digital/analog input port to the analog/digital input port when the digital/analog input port is not receiving a normal digital/analog input signal". Therefore, the DVT 105 does not need to determine anything about the normality of the signal. The rejection specifically states that the user determines the normality of the signal and causes the input port to be switched to and from the digital input and analog input. The last sentence of paragraph [0007] states "Requiring the user to make such decisions can be confusing, especially if DVCR 110 can play tapes that include both analog and digital information". Thus the examiner's scenario given in the rejection as to what will happen when a digital or analog video is played is completely supported by Takano [see paragraphs [0006]-[0007]]. One of ordinary skill in the art would certainly have known how to insert a video into the DVCR 110 given the disclosure of Takano and more so, one of ordinary skill in the art would have known based on Takano's disclosure, that the user will switch between the digital and analog signal ports if a video is inserted and a display is not created. Therefore, Takano et al. still anticipates the claimed invention.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 47-48 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Takano et al. (US 2003/0179822).

Regarding claim 47, Takano et al. disclose a displaying device (Figure 1) comprising:

an analog input port for receiving an analog signal (Figure 1, ANALOG 120);
a digital input port for receiving a digital signal (Figure 1, DIGITAL 115); and
an input port changing unit for switching from the analog input port to the digital input port when the analog input port is not receiving a normal analog input signal (Paragraphs [0006]-[0007] explain that a user would have to switch between the analog and digital inputs using switch 135. If a digital video was played in the DVCR 110 and the analog input channel is selected, then a “normal” analog input signal would not be received. When nothing is displayed after the user presses ‘play’ then the user will switch to the digital channel, meaning that the switching unit 135 will switch based on the signal from digital interface 130 when the analog channel is not receiving a “normal” signal.).

Regarding claim 48, Takano et al. disclose a displaying device (Figure 1) comprising:

an analog input port for receiving an analog signal (Figure 1, ANALOG 120);
a digital input port for receiving a digital signal (Figure 1, DIGITAL 115); and
an input port changing unit for switching from the digital input port to the analog
input port when the digital input port is not receiving a normal analog input signal
(Paragraphs [0006]-[0007] explain that a user would have to switch between the analog
and digital inputs using switch 135. If an analog video was played in the DVCR 110 and
the digital input channel is selected, then a “normal” digital input signal would not be
received. When nothing is displayed after the user presses ‘play’ then the user will
switch to the analog channel, meaning that the switching unit 135 will switch based on
the signal from digital interface 130 when the digital channel is not receiving a “normal”
signal.).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all
obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set
forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and
the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the
invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains.
Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148
USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining
obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
 2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
 3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
 4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.
8. Claims 1-3,6-8, 11-12, 14-19, 24-30, 32-33, 38-46, 49-54 and 56-58 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw et al. (US 5,276,436) in view of Sugihara et al. (US 6,122,018).

Regarding claim 1, Shaw et al. disclose a display device (Figure 3) comprising:
a signal identifying unit that receives an input signal (Figure 3 shows analog multiplex unit 34, which receives an input signal.);
a signal checking unit that checks whether the identified input signal is abnormal (Figures 3 and 6 and column 9, lines 48-53 explain that the microprocessor 36 checks the received input signal from the multiplex unit to determine if there is a horizontal synchronizing signal present or not, where no synchronizing signal means that the input signal is "abnormal."); and
a signal changing unit that switches from the checked input signal to a next input signal to be checked so that the signal checking unit checks whether the next input signal is abnormal, if the identified input signal is determined to be abnormal (Figure 3 and 6 and column 9, lines 53-64 explain that the microprocessor tells the analog multiplex unit 34 to switch to a next input signal to be checked if no synchronizing signal is present, i.e. if it is abnormal, and then the next input signal will be checked for the synchronizing signals to see whether that signal is "abnormal".).

Shaw et al. fail to teach that the signal identifying unit identifies a type of the input signal and also fail to teach that the signal changing unit switches from the checked input signal to a next input signal to be checked based on set data corresponding to the identified type of the input signal.

Sugihara et al. discloses of a display device () comprising:
a signal identifying unit that receives an input signal and identifies a type of input signal (Figure 1 shows the AV switch 2, which receives multiple different types of input signals and identifies these signals so as to be able to output the correct signal as commanded by the microcomputer 7.); and

a signal changing unit that switches from a first input signal to a next input signal based on set data corresponding to the identified type of the input signal (Figure 1 shows the AV switch 2, which is under the control of the microcomputer 7, where the microcomputer 7 switches from a first input signal to a next input signal based on data set by a user which corresponds to the type of input signal. Column 4, line 52 to column 5, line 4 explain that the user sets data corresponding to the switching of the input ports that receive different types of input signals. Figure 4 and column 5, lines 13-50 explain the process of switching between the input signal ports depending on the data set, i.e. being skipped or not, by the user which corresponds to the types of input signals.).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teaching of Sugihara et al. to allow a user to select which input ports to check bas on the input signals connected with the abnormality checking display device taught by Shaw et al. in order to allow for the

automatic changing of input ports based on user preferences such that the switching operation can be simplified to enable rapid switching.

Regarding claim 2, Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. disclose the display device of claim 1.

Sugihara et al. also disclose wherein the signal identifying unit identifies whether the received input signal is one of a D-sub analog signal, a DVI analog signal, a DVI digital signal, and a VIDEO signal (Figure 1 shows that the AV switch 2 receives video signals.).

Regarding claim 3, Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. disclose the display device of claim 1.

Shaw et al. also disclose wherein the signal checking unit checks whether the identified input signal is abnormal by one of decoding the identified input signal and sensing whether an input signal cable is connected to the display device (Column 9, lines 53-64 explain that the microprocessor tells the analog multiplex unit 34 to switch to a next input signal to be checked if no synchronizing signal is present. If there is no cable connected, there will be no synchronizing signal and thus the checking unit will sense whether or not there is a cable connected.).

Regarding claim 6, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 1.

Regarding claim 7, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 2.

Regarding claim 8, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 3.

Regarding claim 11, please refer to the rejection of claim 1, and furthermore Shaw et al. also disclose:

wherein if the checked input signal is normal, the signal continues being displayed by the display device and if the checked input signal is abnormal, the signal stops being displayed by the display device (Column 9, lines 43-64 explain that if the signal is “abnormal”, then the next input signal is checked, which means that the signal will be stopped from being displayed by the display device. Column 6, lines 21-51 and column 9, line 65 through column 10, line 19 state that when a signal is determined to be “normal” then the signal is passed and displayed on the display device.).

Regarding claim 12, Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. disclose the display device of claim 11.

Shaw et al. also disclose wherein the identified input signal and the next input signal are abnormal if cables carrying the signals are not connected to the display device (Column 9, lines 53-64 explain that the microprocessor tells the analog multiplex unit 34 to switch to a next input signal to be checked if no synchronizing signal is present. If there is no cable connected, there will be no synchronizing signal and thus the checking unit will sense there is not a cable connected.).

Regarding claim 14, Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. disclose the display device of claim 11.

Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. fail to explicitly teach wherein the signal identifying unit identifies whether the received input signal is a D-sub analog signal, however, D-sub analog signals are well known in the art, therefore it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art at the time the invention was made that one of the signals identified by Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. could be a D-sub analog signal.

Regarding claim 15, Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. disclose the display device of claim 11.

Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. fail to explicitly teach wherein the signal identifying unit identifies whether the received input signal is a DVI analog signal, however, DVI analog signals are well known in the art, therefore it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art at the time the invention was made that one of the signals identified by Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. could be a DVI analog signal.

Regarding claim 16, Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. disclose the display device of claim 11.

Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. fail to explicitly teach wherein the signal identifying unit identifies whether the received input signal is a DVI digital signal,

however, DVI digital signals are well known in the art, therefore it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art at the time the invention was made that one of the signals identified by Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. could be a DVI digital signal.

Regarding claim 17, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 2.

Regarding claim 18, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 3.

Regarding claim 19, Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. disclose the display device of claim 11.

Shaw et al. also disclose wherein the signal checking unit checks whether the identified input signal is abnormal by sensing whether an input signal cable is connected (Column 9, lines 53-64 explain that the microprocessor tells the analog multiplex unit 34 to switch to a next input signal to be checked if no synchronizing signal is present. If there is no cable connected, there will be no synchronizing signal and thus the checking unit will sense whether or not there is a cable connected.).

Regarding claim 24, Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. disclose the display device of claim 11.

Sugihara et al. also disclose the display device further comprising a menu from which a user determines the identified input signal is to be checked and a checking order (Column 4, line 52 to column 5, line 4 explain that the user sets data

corresponding to the switching of the input ports that receive different types of input signals. Figure 4 and column 5, lines 13-50 explain the process of switching between the input signal ports depending on the data set, i.e. being skipped or not, by the user which corresponds to the types of input signals.).

Regarding claim 25, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 11.

Regarding claim 26, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 14.

Regarding claim 27, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 15.

Regarding claim 28, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 16.

Regarding claim 29, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 17.

Regarding claim 30, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 12.

Regarding claim 32, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 18.

Regarding claim 33, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 19.

Regarding claim 38, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 24.

Regarding claim 39, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 25.

Regarding claim 40, please refer to the rejection of claim 11, and furthermore Sugihara et al. also disclose that the input ports are what is being detected (Figures 3A-3C), and wherein at least one of the input ports has priority in an order of checking by the signal changing unit as compared to another input port (Figures 3A-3C and Column 4, line 52 to column 5, line 4 explain that the user sets data corresponding to the switching of the input ports that receive different types of input signals, and thus the user will determine the priority of the signals, where if VIDEO 1 is skipped and VIDEO 2 is not, then VIDEO 2 has a priority over VIDEO 1.).

Regarding claim 41, Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. disclose the displaying device of claim 40.

Sugihara et al. also disclose wherein the order of checking of the input port is selected among a plurality of checking orders (Since the user can select any channels to be skipped or not, then there are a plurality of orders in which the user can select from.).

Regarding claim 42, Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. disclose the displaying device of claim 41.

Sugihara et al. also disclose wherein the checking order is set by the user (Column 4, line 52 to column 5, line 4 explain that the user sets data corresponding to the switching of the input ports that receive different types of input signals. Figure 4 and column 5, lines 13-50 explain the process of switching between the input signal ports depending on the data set, i.e. being skipped or not, by the user which corresponds to the types of input signals.).

Regarding claim 43, Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. disclose the displaying device of claim 42.

Sugihara et al. also disclose wherein a menu is provided on a screen of the displaying device to set the checking order (Figures 3A-3C).

Regarding claim 44, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 2.

Regarding claim 45, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 3.

Regarding claim 46, Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. disclose the displaying device of claim 40.

Shaw et al. also disclose wherein the displaying device is capable of displaying a computer signal (Figure 3, element 21 is a computer, which are capable of display on the active matrix panel 16.).

Regarding claim 49, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 40.

Regarding claim 50, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 14.

Regarding claim 51, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 15.

Regarding claim 52, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 16.

Regarding claim 53, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 17.

Regarding claim 54, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 3.

Regarding claim 56, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 41.

Regarding claim 57, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 42.

Regarding claim 58, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 43.

9. Claims 4-5, 9-10, 13, 20-23, 31, 34-37 and 55 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shaw et al. (US 5,276,436) in view of Sugihara et al. (US 6,122,018) and further in view of Yamashita et al. (US 5,808,693).

Regarding claim 4, Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. disclose the display device of claim 1.

Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. fail to teach the display device further comprising a data setting unit that sets one of a number of times the identified input signal is checked, a time required to check the identified input signal, and a position of the identified input signal to be checked within a sequence of identified input signals to be checked, wherein if the signal checking unit has not checked one of the number of set times whether the identified input signal is abnormal and has not checked for the period of set time whether the identified input signal is abnormal, the signal checking unit continues checking whether the identified input signal is abnormal.

Yamashita et al. discloses a display device comprising a data setting unit that sets one of a number of times an identified input signal is checked, a time required to check the identified input signal, and a position of the identified input signal to be checked within a sequence of identified input signals to be checked (Figure 2 shows that a timer is set for checking the identified input signal),

wherein if a signal checking unit has not checked one of the number of set times whether the identified input signal is abnormal and has not checked for the period of set time whether the identified input signal is abnormal, the signal checking unit continues checking whether the identified input signal is abnormal (Column 6, lines 1-32 and Figures 2 and 3 shows that the process repeats for checking the input signal abnormality.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to “one of ordinary skill” in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Yamashita et al. in the display device taught by the combination of Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. in order to allow for enough time to check whether the input signal is the correct input signal or not.

Regarding claim 5, Shaw et al., Sugihara et al. and Yamashita et al. disclose the display device of claim 4.

Sugihara et al. also disclose the display device further comprising a signal controlling unit that checks the position of the checked input signal within the sequence of identified input signals to be checked to determine which identified input signal is to be checked after the checked input signal, wherein the signal changing unit switches from the checked input signal to the determined input signal so that the signal checking unit checks whether the determined input signal is abnormal (Figures 1 and 3A-3C and column 4, line 52 through column 5, line 43 explain that the user determines the sequence, where the microcomputer 7 will controller the AV switch 2 based upon the sequence set by the user. And as described in the rejection above, the next signal will then be checked for abnormality.).

Regarding claim 9, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 4.

Regarding claim 10, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 5.

Regarding claim 13, Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. disclose the display device of claim 11.

Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. fail to explicitly teach wherein the identified input signal and the next input signal are abnormal if H-sync and V-sync patterns associated with the signals are abnormal.

Yamashita et al. disclose a display device wherein an identified input signal and a next input signal are abnormal if H-sync and V-sync patterns associated with the signals are abnormal (Column 4, lines 55-65 and column 5, lines 7-15.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Yamashita et al. in the display device taught by the combination of Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. in order to allow for a determination of whether an input signal is able to be displayed or not based not only on the signal being present or not but on whether there is a problem with the signal being presented.

Regarding claim 20, Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. disclose the display device of claim 11.

Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. fail to teach the display device further comprising a data setting unit that sets the number of times the identified input signal is checked, wherein if the signal checking unit has not checked the number of set times, the signal checking unit continues the checking.

Yamashita et al. disclose a display device comprising a data setting unit that sets the number of times an identified input signal is checked, wherein if a signal checking unit has not checked the number of set times, the signal checking unit continues the checking (As shown in Figure 2 the number of times the input signal is checked is 1, so when it hasn't been checked it is checked and after it is checked once it moves on to the next input signal.).

Therefore it would have been obvious to "one of ordinary skill" in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of Yamashita et al. in the display device taught by the combination of Shaw et al. and Sugihara et al. in order to allow for enough time to check whether the input signal is the correct input signal or not.

Regarding claim 21, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 4.

Regarding claim 22, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 5.

Regarding claim 23, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 5.

Regarding claim 31, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 13.

Regarding claim 34, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 20.

Regarding claim 35, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 21.

Regarding claim 36, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 22.

Regarding claim 37, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 23.

Regarding claim 55, this claim is rejected under the same rationale as claim 13.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Martin (US 6,559,893), Carlsgaard et al. (US 2002/0186320) and Beard (US 6,172,712) all disclose of television systems in which multiple different types of input signals can be switched between and then displayed on a display device.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen G. Sherman whose telephone number is (571) 272-2941. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F, 8:00 a.m. - 4:30 p.m..

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Amr Awad can be reached on (571) 272-7764. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SS

18 December 2007

AMR A. AWAD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

